UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,816	03/22/2001	Alejandro Wiechers	10003930-1	6165

7590 10/31/2005	EXAMINER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400	HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-17 and 19-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-17 and 19-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 11 August 2005, Applicant amended Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, 28, 30 and 35, cancelled Claim 2, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 12 May 2005.

In light of Applicant's amendments to the claims, the objections to Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, 28, 30 and 35 previously set forth are withdrawn.

In light of Applicant's amendments to the claims, the rejections for Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-16, 21 and 22 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 23, 28, 30 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- in Claim 23, the term *"is"* in Line 6 should be amended to — was — because the scanned page was scanned prior to the act of reviewing the scanned page. Claims 28, 30 and 35 have the same problem.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 23-26 and 30-33 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sturgeon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,336.

Claim 23:

Sturgeon discloses *a method for providing information corresponding to a scanned document* (see Column 1, Lines 6-12; see Column 2, Lines 16-45 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system analyzes and organizes scanned pages to detect erroneously fed or scanned pages and notify a user of those pages), *comprising:*

- *enabling selection of a characteristic of a page of the document* (**EXAMINER'S INTERPRETATION** – The examiner interprets the phrase "*characteristic of a page*" to be a page number. This interpretation corresponds to the present invention, as described in the Specification, which states that "a registration **characteristic** may include a **page number**" (emphasis added) (see Page 5, Lines 9-10). In **Sturgeon** – see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system permits the user to identify a page designation (e.g., a page number) through a user interface);

- *scanning a page of the document* (see Figure 1; see Column 1, Lines 6-12 –

  Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text);

- *reviewing the scanned page for the selected characteristic* (see Figures 1-4; see

  Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

  Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system reviews

  the page for the page designation selected and entered by the user); *and*

- *based on the act of reviewing, determining if the scanned page is properly*

  aligned for scanning (**EXAMINER'S INTERPRETATION** – The examiner

  interprets the phrase *"properly aligned for scanning"* to mean that a determination

  is made as to whether a registration characteristic for a scanned page

  corresponds with a user-selected registration characteristic. This interpretation

  corresponds to the present invention, as described in the Specification, which

  states that "For instance, if, during the review of a page, it is determined that the

  registration characteristic of that page **does not _correspond_**, *e.g.*, **is not**

  properly aligned, with the selected registration characteristic, correction of the

  page may be facilitated" (emphasis added) (see Page 6, Lines 8-11). As

  indicated in the above discussion, "registration characteristics" comprise page

  numbers. In **Sturgeon** – see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see

  Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation

  in that the document handling system identifies missing or misfed pages, based

  upon the page designation).

Claim 24:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 23, further comprising repeating*

scanning, reviewing and determining for each page of the document (see Figures 1-4;

see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system allows a user to

individually feed the pages of a document into the scanner, thereby allowing the user to:

1) identify a page designation for each page through a user interface, 2) review the

page for the page designation selected and entered by the user, and 3) identify a misfed

or missing page based upon the page designation).

Claim 25:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 23, further comprising designating the*

scanned page for review if it is determined that the scanned page is not properly aligned

for scanning (see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15

through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document

handling system flags missing or misfed pages).

Claim 26:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 23, wherein:*

- *reviewing the scanned page for a selected characteristic comprises determining*

  if the scanned page exhibits the selected characteristic (see Figures 1-4; see

  Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system

determines whether the page includes the page designation selected by the

user); *and*

- *determining if the scanned page is properly aligned for scanning comprises*

  determining that the scanned page is not properly aligned if it is determined that

  the scanned page does not exhibit the selected characteristic (see Figures 1-4;

  see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

  Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system flags the

  page if no page designation is located).

Claims 30-33:

Claims 30-33 merely recite computer software for performing the method recited

in Claims 23-26, respectively. The document handling system in Sturgeon comprises

computer software. Thus, Sturgeon discloses every limitation of Claims 30-33, as

indicated in the above rejections for Claims 23-26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-17, 19-22, 27-29 and 34-36 remain rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon, in view of Liu et al., U.S. Patent

No. 6,735,335.

Claim 1:

Sturgeon discloses *a document processing system for providing information*

corresponding to a scanned document (see Column 1, Lines 6-12; see Column 2, Lines

16-45 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system

analyzes and organizes scanned pages to detect erroneously fed or scanned pages

and notify a user of those pages), *said document processing system comprising:*

- *a scan review system configured for receiving scan information corresponding to*

  a scanned document (see Figure 1; see Column 1, Lines 6-12 – Sturgeon

  discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text), *said*

  scan review system being configured to enable selection of a registration

  characteristic of a page of a document to be scanned (**EXAMINER'S**

  INTERPRETATION – The examiner interprets the phrase *"characteristic of a*

  page" to be a page number. This interpretation corresponds to the present

  invention, as described in the Specification, which states that "a registration

  characteristic may include a **page number**" (emphasis added) (see Page 5,

  Lines 9-10). In **Sturgeon** – see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see

  Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation

  in that the document handling system permits the user to identify a page

  designation (e.g., a page number) through a user interface), *review of image data*

corresponding to the scanned pages of the document relative to the selected

registration characteristic (see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see

Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation

in that the document handling system reviews the scanned page for the page

designation selected and entered by the user), *and, based on the review,*

determine if pages of the document are properly aligned for scanning

(EXAMINER'S INTERPRETATION – The examiner interprets the phrase

"*properly aligned for scanning*" to mean that a determination is made as to

whether a registration characteristic for a scanned page **corresponds with** a

user-selected registration characteristic. This interpretation corresponds to the

present invention, as described in the Specification, which states that "For

instance, if, during the review of a page, it is determined that the registration

characteristic of that page **does not corresponds**, *e.g.*, **is not properly aligned**,

with the selected registration characteristic, correction of the page may be

facilitated" (emphasis added) (see Page 6, Lines 8-11). As indicated in the

above discussion, "registration characteristics" comprise page numbers. In

Sturgeon – see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15

through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the

document handling system identifies missing or misfed pages, based upon the

page designation) *such that, in response to identifying a page of the document*

as not being properly aligned for scanning, said scan review system designates

the page for review (see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8,

Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the

document handling system flags missing or misfed pages); *and*

- *a scanner communicatively coupled to said scan review system, said scanner*

  being configured to receive the document to be scanned and convert printed

  information of each page of the document into scan information, the scan

  information being provided in an electronic format to said scan review system

  (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 21-27 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as

  clearly indicated in the cited figure and text).

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose a registration characteristic, *wherein the*

registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom

margin, left margin or right margin.

Liu teaches *a document processing system for providing information*

corresponding to a scanned document (see Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line

30 – Liu teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *said document*

processing system comprising:

- *a scan review system configured for receiving scan information corresponding to*

  a scanned document (see Figure 2), *said scan review system being configured*

  to enable selection of a registration characteristic of a page of a document to be

  scanned and review of image data corresponding to the scanned pages of the

  document relative to the selected registration characteristic (see Column 3, Lines

27-34; see Column 6, Line 55 through Column 9, Line 65 – Liu teaches this

limitation in that the document handling system performs an analysis of scanned

pages and compares attributes of the scanned pages),

wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line,

bottom margin, left margin or right margin (see Column 6, Line 55 through Column 9,

Line 65 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the analysis and comparison performed by

the document handling system verifies the sizes of the margins on the scanned pages),

for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages

belong to the same document – see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include

a registration characteristic that is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line,

bottom margin, left margin and right margin, for the purpose of, in a batch scanning

process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document, as taught

by Liu.

Claim 3:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said*

scan review system is configured to provide a graphical user interface, said graphical

user interface being configured to enable selection of the registration characteristic (see

Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 21-27; see Column 3, Lines 50-56; see Column 4, Lines

62-67 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system includes

a scanner with a user interface for inputting instructions for performing the batch

scanning job. Also, the computer system includes a monitor, keyboard and mouse for

"receiving data representative of both operational instructions or parameters," as

expressly disclosed in Sturgeon. This disclosure implies that the document handling

system includes a "*graphical user interface*.").

Claim 4:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said*

scan review system comprises means for enabling selection of the registration

characteristic (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejections for

Claims 1 and 3).

Claim 6:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said*

scan review system is configured to determine a page number of each page of a

document to be scanned and to designate scan information corresponding to pages of

the document that are not scanned in page order (see Column 8, Line 15 through

Column 9, Line 35 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling

system locates the page number for each page and employs optical character

recognition to flag missing or misfed pages).

Claim 7:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said scan review system comprises:*

- *means for determining a page number of each page of a document to be scanned; and*

- *means for designating scan information corresponding to pages of the document that are not scanned in page order* (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6).

Claim 8:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said scan review system is configured to generate two files associated with each page of a document to be scanned, a first of said files containing page content information and a second of the tiles containing page number information, said scan review system being further configured to utilize the page number information to arrange the page content information in page number order* (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6. Also, the document handling system discloses a *"first file containing page content information"* in that it includes the scanned digital image of the page and a *"second file containing number information"* in that it includes a text file created through optical character recognition. Finally, the document handling system collates the scanned pages – see Column 9, Lines 14-35).

Claim 9:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said scan review system is embodied on a computer readable medium* (see Column 3, Lines 21-45; see Column 4, Lines 53-67 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 10:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said graphical user interface provides a page viewing window configured to display therein scan information corresponding to a page of the document to be scanned* (see Column 9, Lines 36-49 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system allows the user to view the scanned document).

Claim 11:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 9, wherein said scan review system comprises logic configured to designate pages of the document that were not scanned in page order* (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6).

Claim 12:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 10, wherein said graphical user interface is configured to provide an operator with information indicating*

the pages of the document that were not scanned in page order (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6).

Claim 13:

Sturgeon discloses *the document processing system of Claim 10, wherein said graphical user interface provides a page number field, said page number field being moveable by an operator about said page viewing window such that a location corresponding to a page number of a page to be scanned may be designated, and wherein said scan review system is configured to process scan information located in a vicinity of said page number field to determine the page number of the page* (see Column 6, Line 54 through Column 7, Line 30; see Column 8, Lines 15-24 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system allows the user to input possible locations of page numbers and locates the page numbers through optical character recognition).

Claim 21:

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose *a graphical user interface that is configured to enable an operator to position the registration characteristic selected such that the scan review system compares a position of a document for scanning relative to the position of the registration characteristic selected.*

Liu teaches *a graphical user interface that is configured to enable an operator to position the registration characteristic selected such that the scan review system compares a position of a document for scanning relative to the position of the registration characteristic selected* (see Column 5, Lines 7-45 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system allows the user to define a threshold value for a particular attribute. During the analysis of the scanned documents, the selected attribute for each scanned document will be compared to the threshold value. In this way, the operator *"positions the registration characteristic"* so that the scanned document is compared to the set position), for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document (see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include *a graphical user interface that is configured to enable an operator to position the registration characteristic selected such that the scan review system compares a position of a document for scanning relative to the position of the registration characteristic selected,* for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document, as taught by Liu.

Claim 14:

Sturgeon discloses *a method for providing information corresponding to a scanned document* (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1), *comprising:*

- *enabling selection of a registration characteristic of a page of the document* (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1);

- *reviewing pages of the document relative to the selected registration characteristic* (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1);

- *based on the act of reviewing, determining if pages of the document are properly aligned for scanning* (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1); *and*

- *enabling receipt of scan information corresponding to the pages of the document* (Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 2).

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose *a registration characteristic, wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin and right margin.*

Liu teaches *a document processing method for providing information corresponding to a scanned document* (see Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line 30 – Liu teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *said method comprising:*

- *enabling selection and review of a registration characteristic of a page of a document* (see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 6, Line 55 through Column 9, Line 65 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system performs an analysis of scanned pages and compares attributes of the scanned pages),

wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin and right margin (see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 7, Lines 12-31; see Column 8, Lines 37-49 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the analysis and comparison performed by the document handling system verifies the sizes of the margins on the scanned pages), *for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document* – see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include *a registration characteristic that is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin and right margin,* for the purpose of, in a batch scanning

process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document, as taught

by Liu.

Claim 15:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 14, wherein determining comprises*

identifying pages not properly exhibiting the selected registration characteristic

(Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1).

Claim 16:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 14, further comprising:*

- *determining whether a current page of the document to be scanned corresponds*

  to an expected page number; and

- *if the current page number does not correspond to the expected page number,*

  designating the current page for review (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as

  indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6).

Claim 17:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 14, further comprising preparing an e-file*

corresponding to the document to be scanned (see Column 4, Lines 41-52 – Sturgeon

discloses this limitation in that the document handling system stores the scanned

documents in an archive).

Claim 19:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 17, wherein preparing an e-file*

comprises the steps of:

- *generating, for each page scanned, a first file containing page content*

   information;

- *generating, for each page scanned, a second file containing page number*

   information, each second file being associated with a respective first file; and

- *utilizing the second files so as to arrange the page content information of the first*

   files in page number order (Sturgeon discloses these limitations, as indicated in

   the above rejection for Claim 8).

Claim 20:

Sturgeon discloses *the method of Claim 19, further comprising:*

- *identifying pages missing from the e-file* (see Column 2, Lines 23-28 – Sturgeon

   discloses this limitation in that the document handling system flags missing

   pages in a batch job);

- *scanning the missing pages* (see Column 2, Lines 28-29 – Sturgeon discloses

   this limitation in that the document handling system allows the user to rescan any

   missing pages); *and*

- *providing page content information associated with the missing pages to the e-*

   file such that the page content information is arranged in page number order (see

Column 2, Lines 30-32 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document

handling system automatically places all scanned pages in the proper order).

Claim 22:

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose *enabling an operator to position the*

registration characteristic selected such that a position of a document for scanning can

be compared to the position of the registration characteristic selected.

Liu teaches *enabling an operator to position the registration characteristic*

selected such that a position of a document for scanning can be compared to the

position of the registration characteristic selected (see Column 5, Lines 7-45 – Liu

teaches this limitation in that the document handling system allows the user to define a

threshold value for a particular attribute. During the analysis of the scanned documents,

the selected attribute for each scanned document will be compared to the threshold

value. In this way, the operator "positions the registration characteristic" so that the

scanned document is compared to the set position.), for the purpose of, in a batch

scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document

(see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include

enabling an operator to position the registration characteristic selected such that a

position of a document for scanning can be compared to the position of the registration

characteristic selected, for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining

whether scanned pages belong to the same document, as taught by Liu.

Claim 27:

As indicated in the above rejection, Sturgeon discloses every limitation of Claim

23.

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose *enabling selection of one or more of a*

position of a top line or a bottom line of the page, or a size of a top margin, bottom

margin, left margin or right margin of the page.

Liu teaches *a method for providing information corresponding to a scanned*

document (see Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line 30 – Liu teaches this

limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *comprising:*

- *enabling selection of one or more of a position of a top line or a bottom line of a*

    page, or a size of a top margin, bottom margin, left margin or right margin of a

    page (see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 7, Lines 12-31; see Column 8,

    Lines 37-49 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system

    performs an analysis of scanned pages and compares attributes of the scanned

    pages to verify the sizes of the margins on the scanned pages),

for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages

belong to the same document (see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include

enabling selection of one or more of a position of a top line or a bottom line of the page,

or a size of a top margin, bottom margin, left margin or right margin of the page, for the

purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to

the same document, as taught by Liu.

Claim 28:

Sturgeon discloses *a method for providing information corresponding to a*

scanned document, comprising:

- *enabling selection of a characteristic of a page of the document* (see Figures 1-4;

    see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

    Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system permits

    the user to identify a page designation through a user interface);

- *scanning a page of the document* (see Figure 1; see Column 1, Lines 6-12 –

    Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text);

- *reviewing the scanned page for a selected characteristic* (see Figures 1-4; see

    Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 –

Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system reviews

the page for the page designation selected and entered by the user); *and*

- *based on the act of reviewing, determining if the scanned page is properly*

  aligned for scanning (see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column

  8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that

  the document handling system identifies a misfed page based upon the page

  designation).

Sturgeon fails to expressly disclose *a margin characteristic.*

Liu teaches *a method for providing information corresponding to a scanned*

document (see Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line 30 – Liu teaches this

limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *comprising:*

- *determining a margin characteristic of a page of the document* (see Column 1,

  Line 66 through Column 2, Line 30; see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 4,

  Line 48 through Column 6, Line 35; see Column 7, Lines 12-31; see Column 8,

  Lines 37-49 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system

  determines a margin attribute of a scanned page);

- *scanning a page of the document* (see Figure 2 – Liu teaches this limitation, as

  clearly indicated in the cited figure);

- *reviewing scanned pages for the margin characteristic* (see Column 1, Line 66

  through Column 2, Line 30; see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 4, Line 48

through Column 6, Line 35; see Column 7, Lines 12-31; see Column 8, Lines 37-49 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system reviews scanned pages and compares the margin attributes of the scanned pages to previous scanned pages); *and*

- *determining that the scanned page is not properly aligned if the scanned page does not exhibit the margin characteristic* (see Column 1, Line 66 through Column 2, Line 30; see Column 3, Lines 27-34; see Column 4, Line 48 through Column 6, Line 35; see Column 7, Lines 12-31; see Column 8, Lines 37-49 – Liu teaches this limitation in that the document handling system inserts page breaks where the margin attributes of succeeding pages do not compare favorably),

for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document (see Column 7, Lines 55-62).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Sturgeon, to include a **margin** characteristic, for the purpose of, in a batch scanning process, determining whether scanned pages belong to the same document, as taught by Liu.

Claim 29:

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 24, Sturgeon discloses every limitation of this claim.

Claims 34-36:

Claims 34-36 merely recite computer software for performing the method recited in Claims 27-29, respectively. Thus, Sturgeon, in view of Liu, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claims 34-36, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 27-29.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections based on Sturgeon:

Applicant argues that Sturgeon fails to disclose "*determining if a scanned page is properly aligned for scanning*" because the document handling system in Sturgeon identifies misfed pages by comparing the number of pages actually scanned to an expected number of scanned pages. See *Response* – Page 9, sixth paragraph through Page 10, first full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Claim 23 sets forth the disputed limitation in a context that corresponds to the remaining independent claims. The entirety of Claim 23 reads:

A method for providing information corresponding to a scanned document, comprising:

- *enabling selection of a **characteristic of a page** of the document;*

- *scanning a page of the document;*

- *reviewing the scanned page for the **selected characteristic**; and*

- *based on the act of reviewing, determining if the scanned page is **properly aligned for scanning**.* (emphasis added)

As explained in the above rejection for Claim 23, the examiner interprets the phrase *"characteristic of a page"* (Line 3) to be the page number. This interpretation corresponds to the present invention, as described in the Specification, which states that "a registration **characteristic** may include a **page number**" (emphasis added) (see Page 5, Lines 9-10). Sturgeon discloses this limitation, as indicated in the above rejection.

Further, as explained in the above rejection for Claim 23, the examiner interprets the phrase *"properly aligned for scanning"* (Lines 6-7) to mean that a determination is made as to whether a registration characteristic for a scanned page ***corresponds with*** a user-selected registration characteristic. This interpretation corresponds to the present invention, as described in the Specification, which states, "For instance, if, during the review of a page, it is determined that the registration characteristic of that page **does not correspond**, *e.g.*, **is not properly aligned**, with the selected registration characteristic, correction of the page may be facilitated" (emphasis added) (see Page 6, Lines 8-11).

Thus, in determining whether a scanned page is "*properly aligned for scanning*," the present invention determines whether the **detected** registration characteristic **corresponds with** the **selected** registration characteristic. Sturgeon discloses this limitation in that the document handling system permits the user to identify a page designation (e.g., a page number) through a user interface and determines whether the detected page designations for the scanned pages "corresponds with" the selected registration characteristic (i.e., page designations). To determine whether the detected page designations for the scanned pages "corresponds with" the selected registration characteristic, the document handling system determines whether the detected page numbers for the scanned pages correspond.

Moreover, Sturgeon discloses determining whether the scanned page is "properly aligned for scanning" in that the document handling system, for double-sided scan jobs, determines whether the orientation of a scanned page is "normal" based upon location of the page numbers. If the orientation is determined to be skewed, then the document handling system reorients the scanned page by rotating the page. See Column 6, Lines 17-53.

Thus, as currently recited and defined in the Specification, the disputed limitation reads on Sturgeon.

Rejections based on Liu:

Applicant argues that Liu fails to disclose a layout attribute analyzer that verifies

the size of the margins on a scanned page because Liu does not teach using margins, a

top line or a bottom line as a registration characteristic. Applicant points out that neither

the term "margin" or "margins" appears in Liu. See *Response* – Page 10, second full

paragraph through Page 11, first partial paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The disputed limitation reads "*wherein the registration characteristic is at least*

one of: top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin or right margin" (see Claim

1, Lines 11-13). This limitation is not disclosed in Sturgeon. Thus, the rejections for all

claims comprising this limitation are based on 35 U.S.C. 103, and Liu is used to teach

the disputed limitation and provide proper motivation to combine the teachings of Liu

with the disclosure of Sturgeon.

Liu need not comprise the terms "margin" or "margins" in order to teach the

limitation. Liu can and does teach the disputed limitation without using the words

"margin" and "margins," as clearly indicated in the above rejections and explained in the

following discussion.

The document handling system in Liu expressly teaches "general layout

attributes" of scanned pages that are compared by measuring the overlap area between

regions on separate pages and their size similarity. The system then judges the degree

of overlap and size similarity between the regions to determine whether a sufficient

degree of similarity or dissimilarity is shown. See Liu – Column 8, Lines 50-58. The

attributes are then used to determine whether successive scanned pages belong to the

same document. See Liu – Column 7, Lines 55-62. These portions of Liu clearly teach

computer software that operates in conjunction with a scanner, wherein the software

analyzes characteristics (i.e., **margins**) of the scanned documents.

Accordingly, the disputed limitation reads on Liu

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00
PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
October 27, 2005

DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100